AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Figure 4 has been amended to correct the reference numerals as recommended by the Examiner. A replacement drawing sheet is attached hereto and replaces all prior versions of this drawing sheet in the present application.

REMARKS:

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 14-15, and 17-21 are pending in the present application.

In the initial Office Action, the Examiner initially rejected claims 1-20 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 issued to Ludtke et al. Before discussing this initial rejection of all claims of the present application, Applicant believes it to be beneficial to review the essential features and advantages of the present invention in order to place the discussion of the claims in proper context.

Though his experience and research, Applicant has concluded that the most effective method of presenting information to an audience is through the use of three displays. For example, as part of a presentation, a document containing certain textual bullet points may be presented on one of the three displays, with a related spreadsheet presented on the second display, and a related digital image presented on the third display. The present invention is a system and method that facilitates such a presentation of information on multiple displays. Specifically, the system includes a computing system, such as a desktop or laptop computer, which receives information from an operator for presentation to an audience. In this regard, the computing system may utilize conventional software programs suitable for presentations, such as Microsoft Word® or Microsoft PowerPoint® to generate the information. Furthermore, and perhaps more importantly, software resident on the computing system allows the operator to select the destination display for each document, image, or item of information. In other words, the operator can build and develop the presentation by selecting where to display each piece of information. Once the presentation has been developed, the computing system then creates data packets in a format readable by each display screen for display of the information. Specifically,

each data packet is provided with an identification tag indicating the destination display selected

by the operator. Then, the computing system sends the data packets to a switch box, in which a

separating module determines the destination from the identification tag of each data packet, and

a separating module within the switch box separates the data packets into arrays based on the

selected destination. Finally, the data arrays are sent to a diversion module within the switch

box, where the arrays of data packets are converted into image signals and sent to the appropriate

display screen.

U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441 issued to Ludtke et al. describes and claims a method and

apparatus for partitioning, scaling and displaying video and/or graphics across several display

devices. Specifically, this method and apparatus is used for taking a single video stream and

then partitioning into appropriately scaled image sections for display on multiple adjacent

display devices. For example, such a configuration of multiple adjacent display devices is often

seen in retail establishments featuring audio/visual equipment, with a movie, music video, or

similar program being displayed in an enlarged format on a "wall" of television monitors. In any

event, there is only a single video stream or source of information, with all partitioning and

scaling being performed automatically based on the number of display devices.

Referring now to the claims of the present application, claim 1 has been amended to

clarify that the items of information are inputted by an operator, with the operator selecting and

designating the destination for the display of each item of information. Of course, for a §102

rejection to stand, the cited prior art reference must disclose each and every limitation found in a

claim against which it is cited. See, e.g., Verdgall Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814

F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) ("[A] claim is anticipated only if each and

every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."); MPEP §2131. As described above, Ludtke teaches an automated partitioning and scaling of a single video stream based on the number of display devices. There is no teaching or suggestion for allowing an operator to input multiple documents, images or other items of information, with the operator selecting and designating a destination for the display of each such item of information. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of the cited prior art references.

Claims 2-16 depend from claim 1 and are each believed to be allowable in view of the argument presented above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 17 is a second independent claim, reciting a method of presenting information, but including limitations similar to those of claim 1. Specifically, claim 17 requires that the destination display screen is selected by the operator, and each data packet indicates the selected destination. Again, Ludtke teaches an automated partitioning and scaling of a single video stream based on the number of display devices, not the selection and designation of a destination display screen for each of multiple items of information. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of the cited prior art references.

Claim 18-19 depend from claim 17 and are each believed to be allowable in view of the argument presented above with respect to claim 17.

Claim 20 is a third independent claim. Similar to the claims discussed above, claim 20 states that the computing system formats inputted information into a plurality of data packets, each data packet indicating a destination as selected and designated by the operator. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is also distinguishable over the cited prior art references.

Finally, claim 21 has been added to the present application and is also believed to be allowable over the cited prior art references.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims now pending in the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Nagle, Jr.
Reg. No. 42,923
STITES & HARBISON, PLLC
400 W. Market Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40202-3352
Phone (502) 587-3400
Facsimile (502) 587-6391

KR096:00KR1:398663:2:LOUISVILLE   12

PAGE 13/14 * RCVD AT 8/24/2005 3:23:52 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/26 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:502 587 6391 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-12